A. Interpretation: Aff must defend treating both juveniles and adults in the current adult system:

B. violation: He treats them the same, but creates a new system for rehabilitation

C. Standards:

1. Ground: his advocacy prevents me from having any turns about recidivism and allows him to coop almost all neg util ground, because if they are not jailed and punished then they won’t re-commit more crimes. Recidivism composes the majority of the negative topic lit—the main neg args are that its bad to put juveniles and adults together because they will recidivate. Moreover, this ground loss is qualitatively the worst since I can no longer compare the advantages of the juvenile justice system to that of the adult system since they are both extremely similar processes. And, his interp also kills topic lit because it reduces the debate to a specified form of punishment, which the major authors on this topic don’t write about. Topic lit key because it determines which arguments count, and ground is key because both debaters need an equal threshold to the ballot.

2. His interp is bad because it allows him to fiat any new reform to the criminal justice system. This is bad because:

A. He creates his own ground since he magically makes all states take the same actions and act in the same ways. Their use of fiat power enables them to create a whole new justice system that magically no longer uses the system it has historically used for over a 100 years, exploding his ground.

B. Its unpredictable since it justifies him fiating a bunch of states act in new ways. No evidence or topic lit references the AFF action since he is able to create it. There is no topic lit that references a every state changing their policies, his topic lit of rehabbing is general but it doesn’t deny that in the real world all criminal justice programs will be retributive. Predictability key to fairness because I need to be able to conceptualize a coherent strategy to win the ballot. He’s going to say his reform is justified in the topic lit, but those authors don’t advocate every state changing their policy immediately, rather they just say that this form of treatment would be good.